

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

ALEXANDER REENTS, on behalf of	:	
himself and others similarly situated,	:	CIVIL ACTION FILE NO. 23-cv-14917
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Honorable Martha M. Pacold
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
PUBLIC WIRELESS LLC	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	

---

**INITIAL STATUS REPORT**

Plaintiff Alexander Reents<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter referred to as “Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated submits the attached report.

**1. The Nature of the Case:**

**A. Identify (names and contact information) for all attorneys of record for each party, including the lead trial attorney.**

Plaintiff:

Anthony I. Paronich  
Paronich Law, P.C.  
350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400  
Hingham, MA 02043  
(508) 221-1510  
[anthony@paronichlaw.com](mailto:anthony@paronichlaw.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Wireless LLC had a responsive pleading due on Friday November 10, 2023. Counsel for Public Wireless LLC, who is located in Florida, contacted counsel for the Plaintiff on Sunday November 12, 2023 to inform him that they were preparing a responsive pleading that was likely to be an Answer, but that they were contacting local counsel to file that. Counsel for the Plaintiff has no opposition to a responsive pleading being filed by November 17, 2023, but will take the Court’s direction as to the same. A copy of this report was sent to counsel for the Defendant prior to filing.

Defendant:

**B. Briefly describe the nature of the claims asserted in the complaint and any counterclaims and/or third-party claims.**

The Plaintiff alleges that Public Wireless generated new customers through the use of telemarketing despite not having the requisite consent to contact those individuals who, like the Plaintiff, were contacted using a pre-recorded message, a violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Because telemarketing campaigns use technology capable of generating thousands of similar calls per day, Plaintiff sues on behalf of proposed nationwide classes of other persons who received similar calls.

**C. Briefly identify the major legal and factual issues in the case.**

- Whether the calling conduct at issue is appropriate for class certification pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) and/or (b)(3);
- Whether the Defendant's conduct was "knowing or willful";
- Whether calls were made with consent; and
- Whether the alleged calls at issue are telemarketing;

**D. State the relief sought by any of the parties.**

The Plaintiff seeks to certify the following class:

All persons within the United States to whom: (a) Defendant or a third party acting on its behalf, made one or more telephone calls promoting its goods and/or services; (b) to a cellular telephone number; (c) through the use of a prerecorded voice; and (d) on or after four years from the filing of this lawsuit up until trial.

Plaintiff's calculations of damages will depend on information received in discovery, including the number of calls made. Specifically, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in statutory

damages for each violation of the statute. Statutory damages under the TCPA may be trebled if the Court, in its discretion, deems that a defendant “willfully or knowingly” violated the TCPA.

2. **Jurisdiction: Explain why the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the plaintiff(s)’ claim(s).**

A. **Identify all federal statutes on which federal question jurisdiction is based.**

The Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227.

B. **If jurisdiction over any claims is based on diversity or supplemental jurisdiction:**

(1) **State whether/why the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold or whether there is a dispute regarding the amount in controversy (and, if so, the basis of that dispute).**

(2) **Identify the state of citizenship of each named party. For unincorporated associations, LLCs, partnerships, and other business entities that are not corporations, the state(s) in which any individual members of the business unit are citizens must be identified.**

3. **Status of Service:** The defendant has been served.

4. **Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge: Confirm that counsel have advised the parties that they may proceed before a Magistrate Judge if they consent unanimously and advise whether there is, or is not, unanimous consent. Do NOT report whether individual parties have so consented.**

The parties have been advised, but do not unanimously consent.

5. **Motions:**

A. **Briefly describe any pending motions.**

Public Wireless LLC had a responsive pleading due on Friday November 10, 2023. Counsel for Public Wireless LLC contacted counsel for the Plaintiff on Sunday November 12, 2023 to inform him that they were preparing a responsive pleading that was likely to be an Answer, but that they were contacting local counsel to file that. Counsel for the Plaintiff has no opposition to a responsive pleading being filed by November 17, 2023, but will take the Court's direction as to the same. A copy of this report was sent to counsel for the Defendant prior to filing.

**B. State whether the defendant(s) anticipate responding to the complaint by filing an Answer or by means of motion.**

The Defendant has indicated that it intends to file an Answer.

**6. Status of Settlement Discussions:**

**A. Indicate whether any settlement discussions have occurred;**

No settlement discussions have occurred.

**B. Describe the status of any settlement discussions; and**

Discovery is necessary before any further settlement discussions can occur.

**C. Whether the parties request a settlement conference.**

The parties do not request a settlement conference as discovery as to the size of the putative class is required.

PLAINTIFF,  
By his attorneys

/s/ Anthony I. Paronich  
Anthony I. Paronich

Paronich Law, P.C.  
350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400  
Hingham, MA 02043  
(508) 221-1510  
[anthony@paronichlaw.com](mailto:anthony@paronichlaw.com)

By:

Dated: November 14, 2023